# Dave Allan’s Critical Review

The project for me started late in 2008 when I started to think about what do I want to do for a year-long project. I wanted to do something that was really fun, educational, and within the scope of my abilities. While I was at work one day having lunch I bumped into the general manager and during conversation I told him that I was looking for a project for my degree. He told me he had many ideas relating to work and that we should catch up for coffee and discuss some of them. A week later we met for coffee and he told me about how he would like to take the problem gambling training that they currently offered and make it into a piece of software. He went on to describe how it would have to some kind of administrative and data storage components. I told him I'd have a think about it and get back to him in within the first week of returning to school.

On the second day of school our project group got together for the first time. We hadn't worked together before so we did a quick introduction and brainstorm session to determine what our skills were, and what type of project we would like to do. I told them about the conversation I had with my manager and the idea of making an educational piece of software. After a bit of thought we decide that this could be a good project and I arranged a meeting between us and my manager. That week we met with the casino general manager and he explained what he had in mind for us to do. We decided that we would like to undertake this project and after having it cleared by Sam we prepared a management document, which we got the client to sign and we were all go.

I chose to do this project because of its scope. I had a fair idea already from my work experience of what they wanted, and I knew that even though it wasn't the most complex of projects, we could extend its scope if required. This was an important factor because I had never worked with Joshua and Mark before and I was unsure of their abilities. This project allowed for the worst case scenario of being in a group with a low skill set and still delivering a robust system. Thankfully as we started to make a start on iteration two I was happy with the work that was being produced.

Iteration two consisted of two sections, the first being the researching and gaining an understanding of what the system was that we were to make. This started with frequent client meetings, brainstorming sessions, task analysis, and finally the development of a design document. The design document was sixteen pages of our findings and what we thought the project would be. It covered all aspects such as system analysis, system design, user analysis, environmental analysis, system architecture, and system wireframes. The client was very happy with our documentation, allowing us to move onto the next phase.

The second section of iteration two was developing a functional delivery. This is where the work really ramped up for me, as I had to extend from my very limited understanding of actionscript to produce an interactive front end in flash. I set to work making a basic framework and added custom controls and artwork to it. Once I got the system up and running I began periodically backing it up and changing the version of it (My hard drive on my computer at home has all the versions of the project on it which takes up over 8 gigabytes of space.). From this point on if I had to add functionality which I hadn't tried before, I would ether use a copy of the project, or create a new mini framework specific to testing. This was done to prevent breaking functional code. By the end of iteration two I had made a functional front end with all the basic sections and Joshua had created a web site and a functional database. We delivered this to the client as our delivery and he was pleased with our system.

Reflecting on iteration two I found a considerable obstacle was our lack of group time available. We all worked part time jobs as well as having fulltime study. Realistically we could only meet up on Monday and Tuesday for a few hours as a group. To overcome this issue we divided the work up amongst ourselves and had two scrum meetings a week to maintain deadlines. This worked fairly well for iteration two. Overall I felt pretty good with how this iteration went and began the third iteration with a positive outlook.

The third iteration development process is described in my development document. The document covers all aspects of design and changes made to the front end and module framework I developed.

I started iteration three with a positive outlook but to be honest this began to change after the first month of development. I started to realise I had underestimated the amount of work required to get the front end and modules complete. The modules became very complicated and the functionality was constantly being changed from week to week. I ended up having to divide my time between the front-end development which I worked on with Joshua, and the module framework which I worked on with Mark. This meant at times I couldn't focus on tasks which needed to be done through peer programming as I couldn't do two tasks at once. This obstacle was very frustrating and to resolve this I spent Tuesdays working with Joshua, and began coming in on Saturdays to work with Mark.

In conclusion I think overall we have delivered a good system which meets all the functional requirements. The client was happy with our work and the system that was delivered. I also feel I have learnt a lot from this development process and will take on board the lessons and experiences I have had.